# UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL on MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

CHAIRMAN: Judge John G. Heyburn II United States District Court Western District of Kentucky MEMBERS: Judge D. Lowell Jensen United States District Court Northern District of California

Judge J. Frederick Motz United States District Court District of Maryland

Judge Robert L. Miller, Jr. United States District Court Northern District of Indiana Judge Kathryn H. Vratil United States District Court District of Kansas

Judge David R. Hansen United States Court of Appeals Eighth Circuit

Judge Anthony J. Scirica United States Court of Appeals Third Circuit **DIRECT REPLY TO:** 

Jeffery N. Lüthi Clerk of the Panel One Columbus Circle, NE Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building Room G-255, North Lobby Washington, D.C. 20002

Telephone: [202] 502-2800 Fax: [202] 502-2888 http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov

February 13, 2008

#### NOTICE OF HEARING SESSION

#### Dear Counsel:

Pursuant to the order of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation filed today, you are hereby notified that a hearing session has been scheduled to consider various matters pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

DATE OF HEARING SESSION: March 27, 2008

LOCATION OF HEARING SESSION: Homer Thornberry Judicial Building

District Courtroom #334, 3rd Floor

903 San Jacinto Boulevard Austin, Texas 78701

TIME OF HEARING SESSION: In those matters designated for oral argument, counsel presenting oral argument must be present at **8:30 a.m.** in order for the Panel to allocate the amount of time for oral argument. Oral argument will commence at **9:30 a.m.** 

Please direct your attention to the enclosed Hearing Session Order and Schedule of Matters for Hearing Session for a listing of the matters scheduled for consideration at this hearing session.

- Section A of this Schedule lists the matters designated for oral argument.
- Section B of this Schedule lists the matters that the Panel has determined to consider **without oral argument**, pursuant to Rule 16.1(c), R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 439 (2001).

For those matters listed on Section A of the Schedule, the enclosed blue "Notice of Presentation or Waiver of Oral Argument" must be returned to this office no later than **March 10, 2008.** Note the procedures governing Panel oral argument which are outlined on the enclosed "Procedures for Oral Argument before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation." These procedures are strictly adhered to and your cooperation is appreciated.

Very truly,

Jeffery N. Lüthi Clerk of the Panel

cc: Clerk, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas

Feb 13, 2008

# UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL on MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

FILED CLERK'S OFFICE

#### **HEARING SESSION ORDER**

The Panel issues the following orders in connection with its next hearing session,

IT IS ORDERED that on March 27, 2008, the Panel will convene a hearing session in Austin, Texas, to consider the matters on the attached Schedule under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Panel may, on its own initiative, consider transfer of any or all of the actions in those matters to any district or districts.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Panel will hear oral argument on the matters listed on Section A of the attached Schedule.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Panel will consider without oral argument the matters listed on Section B of the attached Schedule pursuant to Rule 16.1(c), R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 439 (2001). The Panel reserves the prerogative, on any basis including submissions of parties pursuant to Panel Rule 16.1(b), to designate any of those matters for oral argument.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation shall direct notice of this hearing session to counsel for all parties involved in the matters on the attached Schedule.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION:

G. Heyburn II
Chairman

D. Lowell Jensen J. Frederick Motz Robert L. Miller, Jr. Kathryn H. Vratil David R. Hansen Anthony J. Scirica

# SCHEDULE OF MATTERS FOR HEARING SESSION March 27, 2008 -- Austin, Texas

# SECTION A MATTERS DESIGNATED FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

# MDL No. 1921 -- IN RE: NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC., ODOMETER LITIGATION (NO. II)

Motion of defendant Nissan North America, Inc., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee:

#### Central District of California

James Selth v. Nissan North America, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-7841

#### Northern District of California

Nkem Anadu v. Nissan North America, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 5:07-3801

# Eastern District of Michigan

Darryl Hidalgo v. Nissan North America, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-15024

#### Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Michael D. Shaffer v. Nissan North America, Inc., C.A. No. 2:07-4794

#### Eastern District of Texas

Rebecca Womack v. Nissan North America, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:06-479

# MDL No. 1922 -- IN RE: BMW REVERSE TRANSMISSION PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiffs Daniel J. Corbett and David Contino, et al., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey:

#### **District of Connecticut**

Daniel J. Corbett v. BMW of North America, LLC, C.A. No. 3:07-1273

#### District of New Jersey

David Contino, et al. v. BMW of North America, LLC, C.A. No. 2:07-5755

# MDL No. 1923 -- IN RE: FEDEX EXPRESS WAGE AND HOUR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiffs Victor Merlo, et al., and Brendan Masterson, et al., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida or, in the alternative, the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania:

#### Southern District of Florida

Ronald Clausnitzer, et al. v. Federal Express Corp., C.A. No. 1:06-21457

### District of New Jersey

Victor Merlo, et al. v. FedEx Express, et al., C.A. No. 2:07-4311

#### Middle District of Pennsylvania

Brendan Masterson, et al. v. Federal Express Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-2241

# MDL No. 1924 -- IN RE: ATOMOXETINE PATENT LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiff Eli Lilly & Company for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey:

#### District of New Jersey

Eli Lilly & Co. v. Actavis Elizabeth, LLC, et al., C.A. No. 2:07-3770

# Eastern District of Virginia

Eli Lilly & Co. v. Synthon Laboratories, Inc., C.A. No. 2:07-450

# MDL No. 1925 -- IN RE: AIR CRASH NEAR MEDAN, INDONESIA, ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2005

Motion of defendant The Boeing Company for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

#### Central District of California

Willy Kusumo, et al. v. The Boeing Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-5738

### Northern District of Illinois

Andre Adiputra, et al. v. The Boeing Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-250 Purbo Justy Antoro, et al. v. The Boeing Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-1387 Xu Kai Zu, et al. v. The Boeing Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-4845 Nurandini Adi, et al. v. The Boeing Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-4954

### Western District of Washington

Indra Laksono, et al. v. The Boeing Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-1907

# MDL No. 1926 -- IN RE: HALFTONE COLOR SEPARATIONS ('809) PATENT LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiffs Canon U.S.A., Inc., et al., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington or, in the alternative, the United States District Court for the Central District of California:

#### Central District of California

Electronics For Imaging, Inc. v. Acacia Research Corp., et al., C.A. No. 8:07-1333

#### District of Delaware

Heidelberg USA, Inc. v. Screentone Systems Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-601 Konica Minolta Business Solutions USA, Inc. v. Screentone Systems Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-602

### Eastern District of Texas

Screentone Systems Corp. v. Canon U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-340

#### Western District of Washington

Canon U.S.A., Inc., et al. v. Screentone Systems Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-1544

# MDL No. 1927 -- IN RE: TEXAS ROADHOUSE FAIR AND ACCURATE CREDIT TRANSACTIONS ACT (FACTA) LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiff Nichole M. Ehrheart for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

#### Northern District of Illinois

Mario Aliano v. Texas Roadhouse Holdings, LLC, et al., C.A. No. 1:07-4108

### Western District of Pennsylvania

Nichole M. Ehrheart v. Texas Roadhouse, Inc., C.A. No. 1:07-54

#### MDL No. 1928 -- IN RE: TRASYLOL PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Motion of defendants Bayer Corp., Bayer Pharmaceuticals Corp., Bayer HealthCare LLC, Bayer AG, and Bayer HealthCare AG for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut:

#### Northern District of Alabama

Bobbie S. Burnette, etc. v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 7:07-2238

#### Central District of California

Sheila Ware v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 5:07-1305

### Northern District of California

Lupe De Leon, et al. v. Bayer Pharmaceuticals Corp., C.A. No. 3:07-6206 Samuel Nitzberg, et al. v. Bayer Corp., C.A. No. 4:07-4399

#### Southern District of California

Michael O'Connor v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-633

# Middle District of Florida

Deborah Bakan, etc. v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 8:07-220 Melissa Morrill, etc. v. Bayer Pharmaceuticals Corp., et al., C.A. No. 8:07-819

#### Southern District of Florida

Ismael Rodriguez, et al. v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 9:07-81172

#### Middle District of Georgia

Sherry L. Shaw, etc. v. Bayer Healthcare, et al., C.A. No. 4:07-176

### Northern District of Georgia

David E. Wease, et al. v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-1659

MDL No. 1928 (Continued)

#### Northern District of Illinois

Thomas W. Durkin, etc. v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-7162

Western District of Louisiana

Evelyn Moreaux Reider, et al. v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-1688

Southern District of Mississippi

Jonnie Sessums, etc. v. Bayer AG, et al., C.A. No. 3:07-436

#### Middle District of Tennessee

Ada M. Williams v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-4 Linda L. Davis v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-115

#### Southern District of Texas

Kenneth L. Lanham v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 4:07-1687 Vance Pesl, etc. v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 4:07-2819

#### Northern District of West Virginia

Crystal Fast, etc. v. Bayer Corp., et al., C.A. No. 5:07-82

# MDL No. 1929 -- IN RE: SONY 1080P RESOLUTION TELEVISION MARKETING AND SALES PRACTICES LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiffs Jason Demas, et al., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California:

#### Central District of California

Elliot Handler v. Sony Electronics, Inc., C.A. No. 2:07-5212

MDL No. 1929 (Continued)

#### Southern District of California

Jason Demas, et al. v. Sony Electronics, Inc., C.A. No. 3:07-2126

### Eastern District of Michigan

David Date, Jr. v. Sony Electronics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-15474

# MDL No. 1930 -- IN RE: WELLS FARGO MORTGAGE LENDING PRACTICES LITIGATION

Motion of defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois or, in the alternative, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa or other federal district court:

#### Central District of California

Juan Rodriguez, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., C.A. No. 2:07-6780

## Northern District of California

Nancy Jeffries, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-3880 Gilbert Ventura, Sr., et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., C.A. No. 3:07-4309

### Northern District of Illinois

Judy Williams v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., C.A. No. 1:07-6342

# MDL No. 1931 -- IN RE: VIRGIN MOBILE INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING (IPO) SECURITIES LITIGATION

Motion of defendants Virgin Mobile USA, Inc.; Daniel H. Schulman; Jonathan Marchbank; John D. Feehan, Jr.; Frances Brandon-Farrow; Douglas B. Lynn; Mark Poole; Robert Samuelson; L. Kevin Cox; Thomas O. Ryder; Kenneth T. Stevens; Sprint Nextel Corp.; and Corvina Holdings, Ltd., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

### District of New Jersey

Michael Volpe v. Daniel H. Schulman, et al., C.A. No. 2:07-5619

#### Southern District of New York

Ellen Brodsky v. Virgin Mobile USA, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-10589 Roger Joseph, Jr. v. Virgin Mobile USA, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-11060 2 West, Inc. v. Virgin Mobile USA, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-11625

# MDL No. 1932 -- IN RE: FAMILY DOLLAR STORES, INC., WAGE AND HOUR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiffs Luana Scott; Irene Grace, et al.; Shawn Eric Ward, et al.; Melanie Blake, et al.; and Pamela Fowler, et al., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama:

#### Northern District of Alabama

Luana Scott v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc., C.A. No. 7:08-16

### Middle District of Florida

Doris Moody v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc., C.A. No. 8:08-8

#### Western District of North Carolina

Irene Grace, et al. v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc., C.A. No. 3:06-306 Shawn Eric Ward, et al. v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc., C.A. No. 3:06-441 Melanie Blake, et al. v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-244 MDL No. 1932 (Continued)

### Western District of North Carolina (Continued)

Pamela Fowler, et al. v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-316 Lashanda Slater, et al. v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc., C.A. No. 3:07-501

# Middle District of Tennessee

Sheri Toms v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-1277

#### Eastern District of Texas

Betty S. McCarty, et al. v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc., C.A. No. 5:07-194

# MDL No. 1933 -- IN RE: MERRILL LYNCH & CO., INC., SECURITIES, DERIVATIVE & "ERISA" LITIGATION

Motion of defendant Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

#### <u>District of New Jersey</u>

David Eidman, etc. v. E. Stanley O'Neal, et al., C.A. No. 2:08-126

#### Southern District of New York

Life Enrichment Foundation v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-9633 Patricia Arthur, etc. v. E. Stanley O'Neal, et al., C.A. No. 1:07-9696 Michael J. Savena v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-9837 Miriam Loveman, etc. v. E. Stanley O'Neal, et al., C.A. No. 1:07-9888 Elizabeth Estey v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-10268 Mary Gidaro v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-10273 Tara Moore v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-10398 Gregory Yashgur v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-10569 Christine Donlon v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-10661

MDL No. 1933 (Continued)

#### Southern District of New York (Continued)

Carl Esposito v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-10687
Sean Shaughnessey, etc. v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-10710
Gary Kosseff v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-10984
Barbara Boland, et al. v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-11054
Robert R. Garber v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-11080
Operative Plasterers & Cement Masons Local 262 Pension & Annuity Funds, etc. v. E. Stanley O'Neal, et al., C.A. No. 1:07-11085
Francis Lee Summers, III v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-11615
James Conn v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-11626
James Eastman v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-58

# MDL No. 1934 -- IN RE: EPOGEN AND ARANESP OFF-LABEL MARKETING AND SALES PRACTICES LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiff United Food & Commercial Workers Central Pennsylvania and Regional Health & Welfare Fund for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

#### Central District of California

Ironworkers Local Union No. 68 & Participating Employers Health & Welfare Funds, et al. v. Amgen, Inc., C.A. No. 2:07-5157Sheet Metal Workers National Health Fund, et al. v. Amgen, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-5620

#### Northern District of Illinois

Painters District Council No. 30 Health & Welfare Fund v. Amgen, Inc., C.A. No. 1:07-6628

#### Eastern District of Michigan

Linda A. Watters v. Amgen, Inc., C.A. No. 4:07-15354

MDL No. 1934 (Continued)

### Middle District of Pennsylvania

United Food & Commercial Workers Central Pennsylvania & Regional Health & Welfare Fund v. Amgen, Inc., C.A. No. 4:07-2125

#### MDL No. 1935 -- IN RE: CHOCOLATE CONFECTIONARY ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiff Michael McNamara for centralization of certain of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania or, in the alternative, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; motion of plaintiffs CNS Confectionery Products, LLC, et al., and Stephen Snow, et al., for centralization of certain of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey; motion of plaintiffs Katherine Woodman and Glenn Coffey for centralization of certain of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania; and motion of plaintiff Mandel Tobacco Co., Inc., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania:

#### Northern District of California

Scott Lamson v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-153

#### Eastern District of Michigan

International Wholesale, Inc. v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-10215 United Wholesale v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-10275 United Customs Distribution v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 5:08-10276

#### District of New Jersey

CNS Confectionery Products, LLC, et al. v. The Hershey Co., et. al., C.A. No. 2:07-6088 Akisa Matsuda v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-191 Eric Lense v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-192 Diane Chiger v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-195 Stephen Snow, et al. v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-199

MDL No. 1935 (Continued)

# Southern District of New York

Webb's Candies, Inc. v. Cadbury Adams Canada, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-382

### Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Stephen L. LaFrance Pharmacy, Inc., etc. v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-109 Richard Miller, et al. v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-198 Western Skier, Ltd. v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-205 Michael W. DeMarshall v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-253

### Middle District of Pennsylvania

Michael McNamara v. Cadbury Schweppes, PLC, et al., C.A. No. 1:07-2335 Katherine Woodman v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-2336 Glenn Coffey, etc. v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-84 The Lorain Novelty Co., Inc. v. Cadbury Adams Canada, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-101 Mandel Tobacco Co., Inc. v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-122

#### Eastern District of Virginia

STLE Corp. v. The Hershey Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-19

# MDL No. 1936 -- IN RE: TRAIN DERAILMENT NEAR TYRONE, OKLAHOMA, ON APRIL 21, 2005

Motion of Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd., and K-Line America, Inc., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

#### Northern District of Illinois

Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd., et al. v. CMT International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-5675

MDL No. 1936 (Continued)

# Southern District of New York

Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America v. K-Line America, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:06-615

Royal & Sun Alliance Insurance PLC v. K-Line America, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:06-2557

Mitsui Sumitomo Insurance Co., Ltd., et al. v. K-Line America, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:06-2956

Phillips PC Peripherals, et al. v. M/V Chang Jiang Bridge, et al., C.A. No. 1:06-2962

Federal Insurance Co. v. K-Line America, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:06-3038

ACK Controls, Inc. v. K-Line America, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:06-3040

Navigators Management Co., etc. v. Union Pacific Railroad Co., et al.,

C.A. No. 1:06-3042

Tokio Marine & Nichido Fire Insurance Co., Ltd., et al. v. Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 1:06-5159

# MDL No. 1937 -- IN RE: UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE PRIVACY ACT LITIGATION

Motion of defendant United States Postal Service for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of District of Columbia:

#### Northern District of Illinois

Janet Diggins v. United States Postal Service, C.A. No. 1:07-4623

### Western District of Washington

Lance McDermott, et al. v. United States Postal Service, C.A. No. 2:07-1174

# MDL No. 1938 -- IN RE: VYTORIN/ZETIA MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiff RoseAnn S. Flores for centralization of certain of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana or, in the alternative, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio; motions of plaintiffs Rita Polk; Jay Klitzner; Sandra Weiss; Lionel Galperin; Charles D. Maurer, et al.; Ken W. Bever; David DeAngelis; Ciro Verdi, et al.; and Marilyn Woodman for centralization of certain of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey; and motion of plaintiffs ASEA/AFSCME Local 52 Health Benefits Trust, et al., for centralization of certain of the following actions in a single United States district court:

#### Eastern District of California

George Artenstein v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-152

#### Northern District of California

Helen Aronis v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-352 Richard Haskin v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-376 ASEA/AFSCME Local 52 Health Benefits Trust, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-531

#### **District of Colorado**

Ronna Dee Kitsmiller v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-120

#### Middle District of Florida

Marion J. Greene v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-69

#### Southern District of Florida

Sam A. Ciotti v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 0:08-60077

#### District of Kansas

Charles Swanson, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-2040 John P. Dudley v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 6:08-1027

### MDL No. 1938 (Continued)

#### Eastern District of Louisiana

RoseAnn S. Flores v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-674

### **District of Minnesota**

Jody Fischer v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 0:08-203

# Northern District of Mississippi

Susan McCulley v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-16 Lisa Mims v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:08-10

# District of New Jersey

Rita Polk v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-285
Jay Klitzner v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-316
Sandra Weiss v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-320
Lionel Galperin v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-349
Robert J. McGarry v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-350
Charles D. Maurer, et al. v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-393
Daniel A. Brown v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-395
Steven Knight v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-396
Ken W. Bever v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-430
David DeAngelis v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-431
Ciro Verdi, et al. v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-432
Marilyn Woodman v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-437

#### Eastern District of New York

Sigmond Tomaszewski v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-258

## Southern District of New York

Joyce B. Rheingold, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-438 Stanley Levy, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-491

MDL No. 1938 (Continued)

### Northern District of Ohio

Theodore Sahley v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-153 Panayiotis Balaouras v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-198

# Southern District of Ohio

Dennis Kean v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-61

#### Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Fred Singer v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-331

### <u>District of Puerto Rico</u>

Alexis Alicea-Figueroa, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-1099

# MDL No. 1939 -- IN RE: OILILY FAIR AND ACCURATE CREDIT TRANSACTIONS ACT (FACTA) LITIGATION

Motion of plaintiff Melanie A. Klingensmith for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

#### Northern District of California

Elizabeth McCoy v. Oilily B.V., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-4780

# Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Melanie A. Klingensmith v. Oilily Retail USA, C.A. No. 2:07-4321

#### MDL No. 1940 -- IN RE: AQUA DOTS PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Motion of defendants Spin Master, Ltd., and Spin Master, Inc., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois or, in the alternative, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas:

#### Eastern District of Arkansas

Donald C. Erbach, Jr., et al. v. Spin Master, Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 4:07-1112

#### Central District of California

Kim A. Cosgrove v. Spin Master, Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-7544 Sandra Irene Soderstedt v. Moose Enterprise Pty Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-7546

#### Southern District of Florida

Simon Bertanowski, et al. v. Moose Enterprise Pty Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-22941

#### Northern District of Illinois

Robyn Williams v. Spin Master, Ltd., C.A. No. 1:07-6387

### Western District of Missouri

Michael J. Burgess v. Spin Master, Ltd., C.A. No. 3:07-5110

#### Northern District of Texas

Eric K. Botsch v. Spin Master, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-1948

# SECTION B MATTERS DESIGNATED FOR CONSIDERATION WITHOUT ORAL ARGUMENT

#### MDL No. 875 -- IN RE: ASBESTOS PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION (NO. VI)

Oppositions of plaintiffs Laura Contois, etc.; Mary Ellen Harris, etc.; Warren W. Sether, et al.; Harold Hendley, et al.; Michael J. McCurdy, et al.; Dorothy Boyd, etc.; Ruth Shamir, etc.; Claude E. Newman; and Eugene F. Booth to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

#### District of Connecticut

Laura Contois, etc. v. Able Industries, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-1328

### Northern District of Illinois

Mary Ellen Harris, etc. v. Rapid-American Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-6055

#### Southern District of Illinois

Warren W. Sether, et al. v. AGCO Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-809

#### Western District of Kentucky

Harold Hendley, et al. v. American Standard, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 5:07-208

# **District of Maryland**

Michael J. McCurdy, et al. v. John Crane-Houdaille, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-2681 Dorothy Boyd, etc. v. MCIC, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-3311

#### District of New Jersey

Ruth Shamir, etc. v. Agilent Technologies, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-4185

MDL No. 875 (Continued)

### District of Oregon

Claude E. Newman v. Crown Cork & Seal Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-1533 Eugene F. Booth v. ArvinMeritor, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-1544

Oppositions of defendants AstenJohnson, Inc., and Eaton Corp., to remand, under 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a), of their respective following actions to their respective transferor courts:

# Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Diana Wheeler McCarthy, et al. v. Asten Johnson, Inc., et al., (C.D. California, C.A. No. 2:03-3046)

Beatrice M. Chiasson, et al. v. Honeywell International, Inc., et al., (E.D. Louisiana, C.A. No. 2:05-5221)

# MDL No. 1373 -- IN RE: BRIDGESTONE/FIRESTONE, INC., TIRES PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Opposition of plaintiffs Starr F. Traylor and Ruby Yarbrough, et al., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana:

#### Eastern District of Missouri

Starr F. Traylor v. Ford Motor Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-166 Ruby Yarbrough, et al. v. Ford Motor Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-167

# MDL No. 1431 -- IN RE: BAYCOL PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Opposition of plaintiff Mark Stodghill, etc., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota:

#### Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Mark Stodghill, etc. v. Bayer AG, et al., C.A. No. 2:07-5501

# MDL No. 1456 -- IN RE: PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY AVERAGE WHOLESALE PRICE LITIGATION

Oppositions of plaintiff State of Utah to transfer of the following actions to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts:

#### District of Utah

State of Utah v. Actavis US, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-870 State of Utah v. Abbott Laboratories, et al., C.A. No. 2:07-899

#### MDL No. 1507 -- IN RE: PREMPRO PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Oppositions of plaintiffs Minnie Louise Gray, et al., and defendant Wyeth; Wyeth Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Wyeth-Ayerst International, Inc.; Wyeth Pharmaceuticals; and Wyeth, Inc., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas:

### Southern District of Illinois

Minnie Louise Gray, et al. v. Wyeth, et al., C.A. No. 3:07-799

#### District of Minnesota

Garciana Manalo, et al. v. Wyeth, et al., C.A. No. 0:07-4557 Carol J. Hess v. Wyeth, Inc., C.A. No. 0:07-4567

#### MDL No. 1596 -- IN RE: ZYPREXA PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Opposition of plaintiff Greg Bounds to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York:

#### Southern District of Mississippi

Greg Bounds v. Pine Belt Mental Health Care Resources, et al., C.A. No. 2:07-356

#### MDL No. 1603 -- IN RE: OXYCONTIN ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Opposition of plaintiffs Commonwealth of Kentucky, et al., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

### Eastern District of Kentucky

Commonwealth of Kentucky, et al. v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al., C.A. No. 7:07-222

# MDL No. 1649 -- IN RE: HELICOPTER CRASH NEAR WENDLE CREEK, BRITISH COLUMBIA, ON AUGUST 8, 2002

Opposition of defendant Croman Corp. to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut:

#### District of Oregon

Sikorsky Aircraft Corp., et al. v. Croman Corp., C.A. No. 3:07-1483

# MDL No. 1657 -- IN RE: VIOXX MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Opposition of plaintiff Erie County, New York, to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana:

#### District of New Jersey

Erie County, New York v. Merck & Co., Inc., C.A. No. 1:07-5517

# MDL No. 1708 -- IN RE: GUIDANT CORP. IMPLANTABLE DEFIBRILLATORS PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Opposition of plaintiff Judith Maher to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota:

#### Northern District of Illinois

Judith Maher v. Guidant Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-6561

# MDL No. 1715 -- IN RE: AMERIQUEST MORTGAGE CO. MORTGAGE LENDING PRACTICES LITIGATION

Oppositions of plaintiffs Eldora Moore and Phyllis A. Hollis, et al., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

## Eastern District of Michigan

Eldora Moore v. Ameriquest Mortgage Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-14498

# District of New Jersey

Phyllis A. Hollis, et al. v. Ameriquest Mortgage Co., et al., Bky. Advy. No. 3:07-2615

# MDL No. 1718 -- IN RE: FORD MOTOR CO. SPEED CONTROL DEACTIVATION SWITCH PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Oppositions of plaintiffs Terry R. Hamlin, et al., and Rudolpho Reyes, et al., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan:

#### Eastern District of Oklahoma

Terry R. Hamlin, et al. v. Ford Motor Co., et al., C.A. No. 6:07-372

#### Western District of Texas

Rudolpho Reyes, et al. v. Autos Etc., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 6:07-352

# MDL No. 1726 -- IN RE: MEDTRONIC, INC., IMPLANTABLE DEFIBRILLATORS PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Oppositions of plaintiff Reginald Witcher, etc., and defendants Medtronic USA, Inc., and Medtronic, Inc., to transfer of the respective following actions to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota:

#### Middle District of Alabama

Reginald Witcher, etc. v. Medtronic, Inc., C.A. No. 2:07-989

#### District of Nebraska

Nancy McGinley, etc. v. Medtronic USA, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 8:07-424

# MDL No. 1769 -- IN RE: SEROQUEL PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Motion of defendants AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP and AstraZeneca LP to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida:

#### Southern District of Indiana

Mabel M. Hensley, etc. v. Astra Pharmaceuticals, L.P., et al., C.A. No. 1:07-596

#### Northern District of Texas

Pedro Garza, Jr., etc. v. AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals, LP, C.A. No. 3:07-1987

### MDL No. 1811 -- IN RE: GENETICALLY MODIFIED RICE LITIGATION

Opposition of plaintiff Rickmers Reismuehle GmbH to transfer of the following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri:

#### Eastern District of Arkansas

Rickmers Reismuehle GmbH v. Producers Rice Mill, Inc., C.A. No. 4:07-732 Rickmers Reismuehle GmbH v. Riceland Foods, Inc., C.A. No. 4:07-733

# MDL No. 1845 -- IN RE: CONAGRA PEANUT BUTTER PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Oppositions of plaintiffs Tina Walker, et al., and Amanda Wyatt to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia:

#### Central District of California

Tina Walker, et al. v. ConAgra Foods, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 5:07-1423

#### Eastern District of Missouri

Amanda Wyatt v. ConAgra Foods, Inc., C.A. No. 4:07-2064

#### MDL No. 1850 -- IN RE: PET FOOD PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Oppositions of plaintiffs Winston David Snell, et al., and defendant Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey:

#### Southern District of Texas

Winston David Snell, et al. v. Dick Van Patten's Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 6:07-66

# MDL No. 1871 -- IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Oppositions of plaintiffs Leslie Boone; Dorothy Bone, et al.; James Hall; James Jefferson; George Fisher; Hector Thornton; Ivan Upshaw; Rose Hefner, et al.; and Richard Bowles, et al., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

### Central District of California

Leslie Boone v. GlaxoSmithKline Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-7699

MDL No. 1871 (Continued)

#### Northern District of California

Dorothy Bone, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5886 James Hall v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5887 James Jefferson v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5888 George Fisher v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5889 Hector Thornton v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5890 Ivan Upshaw v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5891 Rose Hefner, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-6050 Richard Bowles, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-6328

#### MDL No. 1877 -- IN RE: CLASSICSTAR MARE LEASE LITIGATION

Opposition of plaintiff Gunshy Thoroughbreds, LLC, to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky:

# Eastern District of Michigan

Gunshy Thoroughbreds, LLC v. GeoStar Corp., C.A. No. 1:07-15266

# PROCEDURES FOR ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

All oral argument is governed by the provisions of Rule 16.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (effective April 2, 2001). Rule 16.1(g) allows a maximum of twenty minutes for oral argument in each matter. In most cases, however, less time is necessary for the expression of all views and the Panel reserves the prerogative of reducing the time requested by counsel. Accordingly, counsel should be careful not to overstate the time requested for oral argument.

The Panel insists that counsel limit all oral argument to the appropriate criteria. <u>See generally In re "East of the Rockies" Concrete Pipe Antitrust Cases</u>, 302 F. Supp. 244, 255-56 (J.P.M.L. 1969) (concurring opinion) (discussion concerning criteria for transfer).

Rule 16.1 is duplicated in its entirety hereafter for your convenience.

#### RULE 16.1: HEARING SESSIONS AND ORAL ARGUMENT

- (a) Hearing sessions of the Panel for the presentation of oral argument and consideration of matters taken under submission without oral argument shall be held as ordered by the Panel. The Panel shall convene whenever and wherever desirable or necessary in the judgment of the Chairman. The Chairman shall determine which matters shall be considered at each hearing session and the Clerk of the Panel shall give notice to counsel for all parties involved in the litigation to be so considered of the time, place and subject matter of such hearing session.
- (b) Each party filing a motion or a response to a motion or order of the Panel under Rules 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 or 7.6 of these Rules may file simultaneously therewith a separate statement limited to one page setting forth reasons why oral argument should, or need not, be heard. Such statements shall be captioned "Reasons Why Oral Argument Should [Need Not] Be Heard," and shall be filed and served in conformity with Rules 5.12 and 5.2 of these Rules.
- (c) No transfer or remand determination regarding any action pending in the district court shall be made by the Panel when any party timely opposes such transfer or remand unless a hearing session has been held for the presentation of oral argument except that the Panel may dispense with oral argument if it determines that:
  - (i) the dispositive issue(s) have been authoritatively decided; or
- (ii) the facts and legal arguments are adequately presented in the briefs and record, and the decisional process would not be significantly aided by oral argument. Unless otherwise ordered by the Panel, all other matters before the Panel, such as a motion for reconsideration, shall be considered and determined upon the basis of the papers filed.
- (d) In those matters in which oral argument is not scheduled by the Panel, counsel shall be promptly advised. If oral argument is scheduled in a matter the Clerk of the Panel may require counsel for all parties who wish to make or to waive oral argument to file and serve notice to that effect within a stated time in conformity with Rules 5.12 and 5.2 of these Rules. Failure to do so shall be deemed a waiver of oral argument by that party. If oral argument is scheduled but not attended by a party, the matter shall not be rescheduled and that party's position shall be treated as submitted for decision by the Panel on the basis of the papers filed.
- (e) Except for leave of the Panel on a showing of good cause, only those parties to actions scheduled for oral argument who have filed a motion or written response to a motion or order shall be permitted to appear before the Panel and present oral argument.
- (f) Counsel for those supporting transfer or remand under Section 1407 and counsel for those opposing such transfer or remand are to confer separately prior to the oral argument for the purpose of organizing their arguments and selecting representatives to present all views without duplication.
- (g) Unless otherwise ordered by the Panel, a maximum of twenty minutes shall be allotted for oral argument in each matter. The time shall be divided equally among those with varying viewpoints. Counsel for the moving party or parties shall generally be heard first.

- (h) So far as practicable and consistent with the purposes of Section 1407, the offering of oral testimony before the Panel shall be avoided. Accordingly, oral testimony shall not be received except upon notice, motion and order of the Panel expressly providing for it.
- (i) After an action or group of actions has been set for a hearing session, consideration of such action(s) may be continued only by order of the Panel on good cause shown.